



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,326	12/12/2003	Stadjana Petrovic	47936-0010	9081
23577	7590	05/31/2011		
RIDOUT & MAYBEE LLP 225 KING STREET WEST 10TH FLOOR TORONTO, ON M5V 3M2 CANADA			EXAMINER JOHNSON, CARLTON	
			ART UNIT 2436	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/31/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,326

Applicant(s)

PETROVIC, SLADJANA

Examiner

CARLTON V. JOHNSON

Art Unit

2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-16, 18-26 and 28-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-16, 18-26 and 28-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action vacates the Office Action mailed on 10-27-2010.
2. Claims **1 - 4, 6 - 16, 18 - 26, 28 - 34** are pending. Claims **1, 13, 23** have been amended, Claims **5, 17, 27** have been cancelled. Claims **1, 13, 23** are independent. This application was filed 12-23-2003.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they were not persuasive.
- 3.1 The 112 Rejection directed towards the claim limitation: *"transmitting a redirect message to said browser, thereby redirecting said request to the second server"* is withdrawn due to Applicant's Remarks concerning the redirection of a redirected message. .

A 112 Rejection has been entered based on claim limitation of *transmitting a redirect message to said browser or a client device*. The specification discloses redirecting a message between a first server and a second server. Applicant has stressed in remarks that the redirect request and session token information (session ID and time parameter) must be directed to different destinations (*Remarks Page 14*). The specification discloses that the redirect message in addition to the session ID and time parameter combination are redirected to a second server without going through any intermediate destination(s).

3.2 Applicant argues, *obvious rejection*. (Remarks Pages 11-12)

The Examiner has based the 103 rejection on a teaching, suggestion or motivation to select and combine features from the cited references.

A 103 rejection based on multiple references is a legitimate technique according to the MPEP. The current application is rejected based on Williams, Woods and LEVY. The set of references are in a same field of endeavor as the claimed invention, concerning the processing of content certification. The 103 rejection allows portions of a claimed invention to come from different prior art references.

The rejection to each independent and dependent claim includes a citation from the referenced prior art that discloses the basis for the rejection. Each obviousness combination clearly indicates the claim limitation the combined reference prior art teaches. In addition, a cited passage from the referenced prior art clearly indicates the motivation for the obviousness combination. Each obviousness combination's disclosure is equivalent to the Applicant's claimed limitation(s) for the claimed invention.

All references (Williams, Wood, and LEVY) disclose the transfer of session information such as identifiers, time/date information such as timestamps, and session state information between network-connected systems (servers, clients).

3.3 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *the transfer of the session ID and time parameter*. (Remarks Page 13)

The referenced prior art discloses the transmission of a session ID and a time parameter between two network-connected servers. Applicant has indicated that the rationale for the transfer of the session ID and time parameter is to assist the second

server receiving the redirected message in the processing of session management information. It is not a requirement that the referenced prior art solve the same problem as the claimed invention in order to be combinable.

Despite this fact, the prior art references (Williams, Wood and LEVY) still disclose the transfer of a session ID and time parameter combination between two network-connected systems. Williams discloses the redirection or transfer of a session request. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session information) And, Woods discloses the direct transmission of a session token within a redirected request. (see Wood paragraph [0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: session token with redirection request) And, LEVY discloses the transfer of session information such as a session ID and a time/date parameter (timestamp) between server systems. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

3.4 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *transmitting a redirect message to a browser, thereby redirecting said request to the second server.* (Remarks Page 13)

The specification discloses the redirection of a request message from a first server to a second server. (see specification paragraph [0033]) There is no disclosure to redirect a request message from a first server to a browser (a client system) and then the client system redirecting the request message to a second server (or through an intermediate destination)

Woods specifically discloses a redirect response message transmitted in response to a redirect request. (refer to Section 3.3) The redirect request and the initial request are not transmitted to the same destination. The specification does not disclose the transmission of a redirect request message to a browser (client system) but that a request message is received and that the particular request message is redirected to another server. The specification discloses redirecting a request from a first server to another or a second server.

Woods discloses the direct transfer of session state parameters such as in LEVY that discloses session ID parameter and time/date parameter transferred between network-connected systems. (see Wood paragraph [0050], lines 15-17: session parameters can be passed directly between systems) Williams and Woods disclose the direct transfer of session parameters.

LEVY discloses the transfer of both a session ID parameter and a time and date or timestamp parameter between network-connected systems. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

3.5 Applicant argues, *that the redirect request of Williams does not include a session token. (Remarks Page 13)*

Williams is used to disclose redirecting a request between network-connected systems. Woods is used to disclose the redirection of a session token between network-connected systems in a direct transmission. Applicant is reminded that a 103 rejection based on multiple references is a legitimate technique according to the MPEP. Williams and Woods combination discloses the indicated claim limitation(s).

3.6 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *that the redirect response and session token are transmitted to the same destination. (Remarks Page 14)*

The redirect message (redirected request message) is transmitted from a first server to a second server. Based on the specification and original claims the session token information (session ID and time parameter) are transmitted to a second server. (see specification paragraph [0033]) Based on specification and original claims the redirected request message and the session ID and time parameter combination are transmitted to a second server (same destination). Applicant argues that the redirect message is transmitted to a browser (client system) which is a different destination. There is no disclosure for this claim limitation. (Refer to 112 Rejections)

3.7 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *that the redirect request of Woods is a new session token. (Remarks Page 14)*

Woods discloses the transfer of a session token between network-connected systems. There is no disclosure within the claimed invention indicating whether a new session token as opposed to an existing session token is required.

3.8 Applicant argues, *Independent Claim 23. (Remarks Page 15); transmitting a redirect message to said browser, thereby redirecting said request to the second server and in conjunction with said transmitting, transmitting said session ID and said timestamp directly to second server. (Remarks Page 16)*

The rejection for claim 1 (refer to section 3.2) in the current Office Action indicates the references used to reject these claim limitations. Independent claim 23 has similar limitations as independent claim 1. Responses to arguments for independent claim 1 answer arguments against independent claim 23.

3.9 Applicant argues, *Bachman reference for Claims 7 and 8; for Claims 19 and 20; and for Claims 29 and 30 (Remarks Pages 18-20)*

Bachman is not used to disclose the transfer of session information between network-connected systems but is used to disclose a time-out capability. Williams, Woods, and LEVY disclose the indicated claims limitations for independent claims. Refer to Section 3.2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims **1, 13, 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. For Claims **1, 13, 23**, there does not appear to be disclosure for the previously amended claim limitation: *transmitting a redirect*

message to said browser, thereby redirecting said request to the second server, within the specification or original claims. The specification only discloses that a redirect message is transferred from a first server to a second server. (see Specification paragraph [0007]: redirecting the request to the second server) There is no disclosure that a request message is redirected to a browser (a client system) and then the client system redirects the request message to a second server. For further clarity, there is no disclosure of the redirection of a request message to a client system as an intermediate destination and then transmitting the request message to a second server.

For Claim 13, there does not appear to be disclosure for the amended claim limitation: *the redirect message prompting transmission of said request to said second server*. There does not appear to be disclosure for a redirect message which is used to initiate or prompt the transmission of a request to a second server.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 - 4, 6, 9 - 16, 18, 21 - 26, 28, 31 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Williams et al.** (US PGPub No. **20030005118**) in

view of **Wood et al.** (US PGPUb No. **20040210771**) and further in view of **LEVY et al.** (US PGPUb No. **20020124074**).

With Regards to Claims 1, 23, Williams discloses a method, computer program product of secure session management for a web farm, the web farm including a first server and a second server, the second server having a requested web page, the method comprising:

- a) receiving, at the first server, a request for the requested web page from a browser, said request including an encrypted session token associated with a session; (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: session management; paragraph [0019], lines 1-5: request processing; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: session token; paragraph [0050], lines 10-16; paragraph [0051], lines 14-16: encryption utilized for security; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: program product)

Furthermore, Williams discloses the following:

- b) decrypting, at the first server, said encrypted session token at the first server to obtain session information; (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: validate (decryption required in order to process encrypted information) session information, process encrypted session information; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: program product)
- c): transmitting, at first server, a redirect message, said redirect message prompting transmission of said request to the second server. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session information; implies a redirect message

is transmitted)

e) receiving at the second server, said request; (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 16-18: redirection of session information; implies the redirected request is received at the destination node (server))

Williams discloses for g): verifying said session. (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11; paragraph [0074], lines 7-11: validate session token information, client and session identification information)

Williams does not specifically disclose transmitting, at the first server, said session token to the second server and verifying said session under control of said second server.

However, Wood discloses:

d) in conjunction with said transmitting said redirect message, transmitting, at the first server, said session token to the second server; (see Wood paragraph [0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: session token with redirection request)

g) verifying said session under control of said second server. (see Woods paragraph [0052], lines 13-17: receives request and determine appropriate authentication scheme to achieve a given trust level)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for transmitting, at the first server, said session token to the second server and verifying said session under control of said second server as taught by Wood. One

of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Wood to upgrade session credentials and maintain session continuity. (see Wood paragraph [0016], lines 11-16)

Williams-Wood does not specifically disclose the transfer of a session ID parameter and time and date (timestamp) parameters between two network-connected systems (servers).

However, LEVY discloses: for b): obtain a session ID and a timestamp and for c): wherein including transmitting said session ID and timestamp directly to the second server. (see LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

And, LEVY discloses for f): receiving, at the second server, said session ID and said timestamp from said first server; (see LEVY paragraph [0071], lines 2-4: record corresponding to session_id is retrieved; (implies record is received at the network node); paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: message sent to server; implies information received at server)

The explicit transfer of a session ID and a timestamp (both parameters) between network-connected systems is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams-Wood for the transfer of a session ID parameter and time and date (timestamp) parameters as taught by LEVY. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of LEVY to enable real-time monitoring of

systems to greatly assist in the management of sessions between network-connected systems. (see LEVY paragraph [0027], lines 1-5)

With Regards to Claims 2, 24, Williams discloses the method, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 23, further including creating a new session token, encrypting said new session token at the second server to produce a new encrypted session token, and transmitting a response to said browser from the second server, wherein said response includes said new encrypted session token. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 7-13; paragraph [0016], lines 4-7: generate new encrypted session token and transfer; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 3, 5, 15, 25, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 2, 13, 14, 23, 24, wherein said creating a new session token includes generating a new session ID and updating said timestamp. (see Williams paragraph [0062], lines 9-16; paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: session token, session ID and timestamp; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

LEVY specifically discloses a session ID and a timestamp as disclosed in claim 1 above.

With Regards to Claims 4, 16, 26, Williams discloses the method, system, computer

program product claimed in claims 2, 14, 24, further including a step of updating a common session database by replacing said session information with said new session token in said common session database. (see Williams paragraph [0069], lines 9-15: database for session token information storage paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

Williams does not disclose the transfer of a session ID parameter and a time and date (timestamp) parameter between two network connected systems.

However, LEVY discloses transmitting said session ID and timestamp directly to the second server. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

The explicit transfer of a session ID and a timestamp (both parameters) between network-connected systems is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for the transfer of a session ID parameter and time and date (timestamp) parameter as taught by LEVY. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of LEVY to enable real-time monitoring of systems to greatly assist in the management of sessions between network-connected systems. (see LEVY paragraph [0027], lines 1-5)

With Regards to Claims 6, 18, 28, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 17, 23, wherein a common session database contains a stored session ID and a stored timestamp, and wherein said verifying

includes comparing said session ID and said timestamp with said stored session ID and said stored timestamp. (see Williams paragraph [0069], lines 9-15: database for session token information storage; paragraph [0062], lines 9-16; paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: session token, session ID and timestamp; paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: verification session information paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 9, 21, 31, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 13, 23, wherein said step of transmitting includes incorporating said session information into a URL. (see Williams paragraph [0044], lines 8-12: URL processing techniques utilized paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

Williams-Wood does not specifically disclose incorporating a session ID parameter and a time and data (timestamp) parameter into a record.

However, LEVY discloses incorporating said session ID and timestamp into a record. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

The explicit transfer of a session ID and a timestamp (both parameters) between network-connected systems is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for incorporating said a session ID parameter and a time and date (timestamp) parameter into a record as taught by LEVY. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to employ the teachings of LEVY to enable real-time monitoring of systems to greatly assist in the management of sessions between network-connected systems.
(see LEVY paragraph [0027], lines 1-5)

With Regards to Claims 10, 32, Williams discloses the method, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 23, wherein a session management web service performs said step of verifying, said session management web service being accessible to said first server and said second server, and wherein said verifying includes comparing said session information with stored session data. (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: session information verification paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

Williams does not specifically disclose transferring said session ID and time and date (timestamp) between systems.

However, LEVY discloses transferring said session ID and timestamp between systems. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

The explicit transfer of a session ID and a timestamp (both parameters) between network-connected systems is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for the transfer of session ID and time and date (timestamp) between systems as taught by LEVY. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of LEVY to enable real-time monitoring of systems to greatly assist in the

management of sessions between network-connected systems. (see LEVY paragraph [0027], lines 1-5)

With Regards to Claims 11, 33, Williams discloses the method, computer program product claimed in claims 10, 32, wherein the web farm further includes a common session database containing said stored session data. (see Williams paragraph [0013], lines 5-9; paragraph [0036], lines 3-4: web farms, set of interconnected web servers paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claims 12, 22, 34, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 13, 23, wherein said requested web page includes a web resource selected from the group including an applet, an HTML page, a Java server page, and an Active server page. (see Williams paragraph [0044], lines 3-8; paragraph [0042], lines 8-15: protected resource, a HTML web page paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

With Regards to Claim 13, Williams discloses a system for secure session management, the system being coupled to a network and receiving a request for a requested web page from a browser via the network, the request including an encrypted session token, the system comprising:

- a) a first server including a first request handler for receiving the request and decrypting the encrypted session token to produce session information. (see

Williams paragraph [0013], lines 5-9; paragraph [0050], lines 10-16: multiple servers, encrypted; paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: validate (i.e. must decrypt in order to process) session information)

Furthermore, Williams discloses the following:

- b) a second server including the requested web page; (see Williams paragraph [0013], lines 5-9: multiple servers; paragraph [0044], lines 3-8; paragraph [0042], lines 8-15: resource requested, a HTML web page)
- c) a common session database including stored session data; (see Williams paragraph [0069], lines 9-15: database for session token information storage)
- d) a session management web service, accessible to said first server and said second server and including a validation component for comparing said session token with said stored session data; (see Williams paragraph [0020], lines 8-11: session verification information)

Williams discloses for e): wherein said first request handler adapted to transmit a redirect message, the redirect message prompting transmission of said request to said second server. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection capabilities)

Williams does not specifically disclose the transfer of session state information between two servers.

However, Wood discloses:

- e) transmit the session information to said second server. (see Wood paragraph

[0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: session token with redirection request; paragraph [0050], lines 15-17: direct transfer of parameters between two systems)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for the transfer of session state information between two servers as taught by Wood. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Wood in order to enable the capability to upgrade session credentials and maintain session continuity. (see Wood paragraph [0016], lines 11-16)

Williams does not specifically disclose transmitting said session ID and timestamp between systems.

However, LEVY discloses transmitting said session ID and timestamp between systems. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))

The explicit transfer of a session ID and a timestamp (both parameters) between network-connected systems is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams for transmitting said session ID and timestamp between systems as taught by LEVY. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of LEVY to enable real-time monitoring of systems to greatly assist in the management of sessions between network-connected systems. (see LEVY paragraph [0027], lines 1-5)

With Regards to Claim 14, Williams discloses the system claimed in claim 13, wherein said session management web service includes a token generator for creating a new session token for said second server, and wherein said second server includes a second request handler, said second request handler encrypting said new session token to produce a new encrypted session token and transmitting a response to said browser, wherein said response includes said new encrypted session token. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 7-10; paragraph [0016], lines 4-7: new session token generated and transferred; paragraph [0050], lines 10-16; paragraph [0051], lines 14-16: encrypted session token information)

8. Claims **7, 8, 19, 20, 29, 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Williams** in view of **Wood** and further in view of **LEVY** and **Bachman et al.** (US Patent No. **5,907,621**).

With Regards to Claims 7, 19, 29, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 1, 14, 23. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 1-5 : time parameter usage and processing; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

Williams does not specifically disclose a time out processing capability.

However, Bachman discloses wherein including determining whether a session has timed out, said step of determining including determining an elapsed time between said timestamp and a current server time, and comparing said elapsed time with a

predetermined maximum time to determine whether said session has timed out. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67: session management; col. 4, lines 11-17; col. 6, lines 10-19: process time out condition)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to process a time out condition as taught by Bachman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bachman to create a secure communications session between server and client systems and avoid distracting the client with the placement of token information within the page. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67; col. 2, lines 15-17)

With Regards to Claims 8, 20, 30, Williams discloses the method, system, computer program product claimed in claims 7, 19, 29. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: time parameter usage and processing; paragraph [0016], lines 1-4: software implementation, program product)

Williams does not specifically disclose a time out processing capability.

However Bachman discloses wherein includes closing said session if said session has timed out. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67: session management; col. 4, lines 11-17; col. 6, lines 10-19: process time out condition, session erased, closed)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Williams to process a time out condition as taught by Bachman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bachman to create a secure communications session between server and client systems and avoid distracting the

client with the placement of token information within the page. (see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67; col. 2, lines 15-17)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/733,326
Art Unit: 2436

Page 22

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2436

CVJ
April 11, 2011

/Nasser Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436